

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7 and 10-12 are amended, and claims 15-20 are added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Ms. Jaquelin K. Spong, at the personal interview conducted August 19, 2003. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks, and constitutes Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action objects to claims 10 and 11. By this Amendment, claims 10 and 11 are amended to obviate this grounds of objection. In particular, claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations previously recited in claims 4, 3 and 2; claim 11 has been amended to include limitations previously recited in claims 7, 6 and 5, thereby removing the improper multiple dependencies. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Nakayama (U.S. Patent 5,554,911). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Nakayama does not disclose "a wavelength at a peak of light emission of the light-emitting layer corresponding to a wavelength at a peak of transmittance of the transparent electrode," as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Nakayama does not disclose "a film thickness chosen so that a peak in the transmittance of the transparent electrode corresponds to a peak in the emission spectrum of the light emitting layer," as recited in claims 2-7 and 12.

In Nakayama, the thicknesses of the color filters are determined based on the desired color of the output light as filtered from a broadband emission source. Nakayama discloses at col. 2, lines 60-64: "Preferably, a single organic material is used for all the optical micro-cavity structures (i.e., all pixels) of the element, this organic material having a natural

emission spectrum containing the desired wavelengths of all the micro-cavity structures," and at col. 4, lines 17-23: "The value d for each micro-cavity is changed by changing the thickness of the transparent conduction film 103, so that the peak in the resonance wavelength of the optical micro-cavity is set as desired in the range between 450 nm and 700 nm. As indicated, three colors, i.e., red (R), green (G), and blue (B) are taken out from the single element of Fig. 1."

Therefore, the thickness of the transparent electrode is not chosen so that a peak in the transmittance of the transparent electrode corresponds to a peak in the emission spectrum of the light emitting layer. The thickness is determined by the desired output wavelength of the colored filter. This is clearly shown in Fig. 2 of Nakayama where the peak of the blue, green and red filters are located at approximately 450 nm, 550 nm, and 650 nm to filter a broad spectrum of light coming from the light emitting layer which has a peak at about 525 nm. Therefore, none of the peaks in the transmittance of the transparent electrode corresponds to a peak in the emission spectrum of the light emitting layer.

Therefore, as agreed to during the personal interview, Nakayama does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1, 3, 4 and 12-14, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over Duggal (U.S. Patent 6,515,314). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Duggal also does not disclose this feature of "a film thickness chosen so that a peak in the transmittance of the transparent electrode corresponds to a peak in the emission spectrum of the light emitting layer." Duggal discloses only that "the thickness of the ITO anode layer is typically in the range from about 50 nm to 400 nm, preferably from about 50 nm to about 200 nm. ITO is substantially transparent to light transmission and allows at least 80% light transmitted therethrough. " See col. 4, lines 46-50.

Furthermore, Duggal in Figs. 7 and 8 illustrates a light emitting layer which emits different wavelengths of light. However, the ITO anode layer is not adjusted according to the wavelength of the emitted light. The thicknesses of layers 150 through 153 and layer 130 are shown as being uniform across each pixel of each different light emitting region in Figs. 7 and 8. Therefore, while Duggal does disclose a thickness range for the ITO layer which overlaps the thickness range claimed, he does not disclose any special selection of thicknesses within that range, as disclosed in Figs. 4 and 5 of the present application. Nowhere does Duggal disclose that the thickness of the transparent electrode is "chosen so that a peak in the transmittance of the transparent electrode corresponds to a peak in the emission spectrum of the light emitting layer," as recited in claims 1-7 and 12.

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nakayama in view of Duggal. However, claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Nakayama and Duggal, either alone or in combination, according to the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, as agreed to during the personal interview, claims 1-9 and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Claims 10, 11 and 13 depend from claim 1; claim 14 depends from claim 12; claim 15 depends from claim 2; claim 16 depends from claim 3; claim 17 depends from claim 4; claim 18 depends from claim 5; claim 19 depends from claim 6; and claim 20 depends from claim 7. Therefore, claims 10, 11 and 13-20 are patentable by their dependence on patentable independent claims according to the arguments set forth above, as well as for any additional features they recite. Therefore, each of claims 1-20 is patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jaquelin K. Spong
Registration No. 52,241

JAO:JKS/ale

Date: October 6, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--